



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vugnia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/781,383	02/12/2001	Karel Elbert Kuijk	NL 000045	1640
	24737 7	7590 05/22/2003			
	PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP 580 WHITE PLAINS RD			EXAMINER	
				PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
	TARRYTOWN, NY 10591			i an ini, shi i ini s	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2673	(X)
		•		DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

91

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
, Office Action Comment	09/781,383	KUIJK, KAREL ELBERT
· Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeff Piziali	2673
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	J. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	<u>0 February 2003</u> .	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	wance except for formal mater er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	tters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 February 2001</u> is/a	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	ected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		isapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in	• •	
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		
 Certified copies of the priority docume 	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	pplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the present of the pr	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	stic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705).

Regarding claim 1, Shimura discloses a display device [Fig. 1, 32] comprising a liquid crystal between a first substrate provided with row/selection electrodes [Fig. 1, 29-31] and a second substrate provided with column/data electrodes [Fig. 1, 23-25], in which overlapping parts of row and column electrodes define pixels, drive means [Fig. 1, 22] for driving the column electrodes in conformity with an image to be displayed, and drive means [Fig. 1, 28] for driving the row electrodes which, in the operating condition, sequentially supply groups of p row electrodes with p mutually orthogonal signals [Fig. 3, f(1-N)], wherein the mutually orthogonal signals are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time [Fig. 3, t], within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first

(positive) polarity which opposes a second (zero) polarity of the other pulses (see Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 2, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, within which four elementary units of time the one pulse having the first (positive) polarity which opposes the second (zero) polarity of the other pulses each time shifts by one elementary unit of time (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 3, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time which, viewed in a time sequence, are situated one after the other (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 4, Shimura discloses at least two orthogonal signals have opposed DC contents (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 5, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, in which the elementary units of the orthogonal functions are interwoven (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Line 61 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 6, Shimura discloses p=4, and in that four orthogonal signals have identical DC contents and four are free from a DC voltage (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 7, Shimura discloses the DC content of 2 orthogonal signals of the orthogonal signals having an identical DC content is opposed to that of the two other orthogonal signals (see Fig. 3; Column 1, Lines 39-60).

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 12, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 6.

'Application/Control Number: 09/781,383

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705) in view of Ito et al. (US 6,252,573).

Regarding claim 8, Shimura does not expressly disclose that the drive means inverts the orthogonal signals after each frame period. However, Ito does disclose inverting orthogonal signals after each frame period (see Figs. 8A-D; Column 17, Lines 1-65). Shimura and Ito are analogous art because they are from the shared field of LCD device driving methods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Ito's per-frame inversion technique with Shimura's display device, so as to maintain display brightness and prevent a reduction in contrast.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 8.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 20, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends the cited prior art of Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705) fails to teach that the mutually orthogonal signals are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first polarity which opposes a second polarity of the other pulses. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Shimura discloses the mutually orthogonal signals [Fig. 3, f(1-N)] are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time [Fig. 3, t], within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first (positive) polarity which opposes a second (zero) polarity of the other pulses (see Column 1, Lines 39-60). By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed proper, and thereby maintained.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

May 19, 2003

BIPIN SHALWALA

SUPERVICEDY PATENT EXAMINER

1000 SANCER 2800